



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*The History of England from Addington's Administration to the Close of William IV's Reign (1801-1837).* By the Hon. GEORGE C. BRODRICK, D.C.L., completed and revised by J. K. FOTHERINGHAM, M.A. [*The Political History of England*, edited by WILLIAM HUNT and REGINALD LANE POOLE, Volume XI.] (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. Pp. xix, 486.)

MR. BRODRICK accepted a difficult task when he undertook to write the history of a period of English national life so full of controversial matter as that from 1801 to 1837. What he produced is certainly not a great book; it presents no particularly new views and draws upon no material hitherto unused; it is neither brilliant, nor striking, either in style or in matter. Nevertheless, it deserves greater praise than is due to these qualities, for it covers the field thoroughly, its writer's views of controverted questions are unusually sound; his judgment is excellent, his temper almost ideal. So fair is he, so impartial in his array of the facts and in the conclusions drawn from them, that it would be difficult to determine, if one judged from this book alone, whether Mr. Brodrick was in his politics a liberal or a conservative.

The writer is particularly happy in judgment and temper when he has to portray the characters and weigh the achievements of English politicians, statesmen or military leaders. His little character-sketches are models of their kind, admirable for insight, completeness and brevity. Perhaps the best are those of Brougham, Peel and Huskisson, though it is almost invidious to discriminate where all are so good. His tribute to Castlereagh is thoroughly deserved and does complete justice to a statesman who has so long suffered in the comparison with Canning, despite the fact that the materials for a correct judgment have always been at the disposal of historians.

What has thus far been said applies with especial force to the treatment of English affairs and English men. When the writer (in this case Mr. Fotheringham) touches continental or American affairs the sureness of touch vanishes, the knowledge is plainly not so full nor so accurate, the authorities depended upon are not so reliable—in a word, the work is distinctly below the standard of that part which is devoted to purely English matters. There are errors in fact and there are errors in judgment. The opinion of Napoleon and of his acts is the old-fashioned English one, though there is no trace of the old-fashioned English bitterness. In the treatment of American events, though the writer is fair in so far as his information permits him to be fair, he relies upon authorities which need constant checking, and so far as one can determine by reading over the list of books, this check has not been applied. Thus in treating of the naval events of the War of 1812 he draws upon James, apparently to the exclusion of all other writers, but a man versed in this history would not have neglected Henry Adams's ac-

counts of the sea-fights, if he chose to pass by our professional naval historians. The accounts of naval duels are not accurate. Neither is the relation of the facts leading up to the firing on the Chesapeake by the Leopard. Yet no fair-minded American can find fault with the general account or the general conclusions.

These criticisms fall to Mr. Fotheringham's share. On the other hand, even Mr. Brodrick departs from his judicial calm when he considers Irish events or Irish characters. O'Connell is almost the only person in the book who is treated with something less than his deserts, and whom the writer rarely mentions without a derogatory epithet. George IV. alone shares this unhappy distinction with the Irish champion, but in George's case the judgment is fair and righteous altogether; in the case of O'Connell it is not so. A similar criticism must be made wherever the writer touches upon the action of the Irish people. He lacks sympathy with them; he lacks understanding of them. In particular he cannot forgive O'Connell and his followers for what he calls their ingratitude in refusing to support the government which granted Catholic Emancipation. Yet he admits that this government was forced to grant emancipation; that it was nothing more or less than a capitulation to the Irish. It would more than task his abilities to explain to the world why the Irish or any one else should feel gratitude for a compulsory favor.

A fault common in most English books is not avoided in this. Everywhere the pages are crowded with wearisome and unessential details. Thus Mr. Brodrick never fails to name every member of a new administration when the new administration comes into office. Similarly he seems to think it necessary to mention every fact in English history which occurred during the period under consideration. It is not that he does not discriminate between the essential and the unessential. He does this admirably, but he seems to lack the moral courage to throw over the comparatively worthless part of his cargo. The multifarious details add nothing to the force of the story, while they tend to distract and confuse the reader.

Mr. Brodrick very properly stresses the importance of economic events in this period of English history, especially those economic facts which are connected with national politics. Thus he emphasizes Huskisson's policy, pointing out that it necessarily led to free-trade and was intended to lead to it. Huskisson's merit in procuring the overthrow of the old Navigation acts and the adoption of reciprocity as a step towards eventual free-trade is well and clearly told and proper credit given to Huskisson's foresight and clearness of vision. On economic questions, generally, the author is much more at home than is customary with historians, and it is only to be regretted that he did not bestow a little more space upon the sufferings of the factory population and the causes of those sufferings than he has seen fit to do. It is true that these things are not overlooked, but they might justly be stressed more than they are.

The account of the reform act of 1832 and its passage through Parliament is especially full and especially good. The writer points out clearly the importance of the act and the fact that it was in the nature of a compromise between the extremely radical demands of one party and the conservative opposition of the other. Issue may, however, be taken with his conclusion that the act created a revolution in the English state system by destroying the balance between King, Lords and Commons and throwing the final decision of all disputed questions into the hands of the lower house. The truth is that the act never could have been passed if the revolution had not already taken place, and if the Lords and King had not already been relegated to a position of secondary importance in the English constitution. What the act did was to furnish means for the completion of a revolution already far on the way to completion.

It is a pity that Mr. Brodrick did not live to give the book its final revision. As already intimated, Mr. Fotheringham was hardly equal to completing the task as well as his elder would have done it. Some minor criticisms connected with the failure to revise thoroughly may be made. For instance, Mr. Fotheringham very absurdly uses the names Peter and Pedro indifferently in speaking of the Emperor of Brazil. He does this constantly and on the same page. Such carelessness is inexcusable. Ibrahim Pasha was the adopted son of Mehemet Ali. It is doubtful if the break-up of the coalition killed Pitt. Napoleon did not need Santo Domingo in order to hold Louisiana, but desired Louisiana in order to carry out his Santo Domingo policy. The bibliography is lamentably weak in foreign titles, and Seknosos for Seignobos is an error sufficient to justify doubt of the compiler's knowledge of the French writer. Finally, it would have been better to omit the chapter on Literature and Social Progress.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

*Lord Hobhouse, a Memoir.* By L. T. HOBHOUSE and J. L. HAMMOND. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1905. Pp. 280.)

THOUGH the name of Lord Hobhouse will be known on this side of the Atlantic only to specialists, he played a considerable part in the readjustment of modern English society to changed conditions. As a member of the Charity Commission he was conspicuous in attacking abuses connected with charitable endowments. On the endowed Schools Commission he did similar work. He was partly instrumental in securing wider rights for married women to hold property independently of their husbands. He served in India as the legal member of the governing Council. In time he became a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and he was made a peer in order that he might aid in the legal work of the House of Lords. He also was, in later years, a member of the London School Board and of the London County Council.